DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 839 EA 023 314

TITLE	Restructuring the Education System: A Consumer's Guide, Volume 1.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.
REPORT NO	SI-91-4
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ECS Distribution Center, 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Experimental Schools; *Nontraditional Education; School Effectiveness; School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

Overviews of 10 major restructuring initiatives in the United States are provided in this publication. The programs share a questioning attitude, vision-based goals, a focus on hands-on learning, an assumption of all children's learning potential, new approaches to thinking and problem-solving, and new participant roles. Each program is described according to its history, beliefs and goals, implementation, teaching content and practices, participant roles, assessment, funding, and per-pupil cost. A contact address is also provided. The 10 programs include Coalition of Essential Schools; Foxfire; The Mastery in Learning Consortium; Montessori in the Public Schools; The Paideia Press; Re: Learning; School Development Program; The Stanford Accelerated Schools Project; Success for All; and Whole Language. A glossary of terms is included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336839

EA

Restructuring the Education System

A CONSUMER'S GUIDE

VOLUME I

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. F. Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 023 314

Education Commission of the States

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RESTRUCTURING THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

A CONSUMER'S GUIDE

VOLUME I

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Coalition of Essential Schools	5
Foxfire	7
The Mastery in Learning Consortium	9
Montessori in the Public Schools	11
The Paideia Program	13
Re: Learning	15
School Development Program	17
The Stanford Accelerated Schools Project	19
Success For All	21
Whole Language	23
Glossary	25

INTRODUCTION

Why A *Consumer's Guide* to initiatives to restructure the education system?

With so much local, state and national talk about "school restructuring" and "system change," interest in school improvement is at an all-time high. At the same time, many people are confused by the number and have questions about the variety of programs and proposals for reform. *What kinds of initiatives are under way? What are they trying to accomplish? What are their track records? Should my community or state adopt or adapt an existing effort or start our own? What kinds of help are available?*

This guide represents an initial effort to answer some of those questions by providing brief overviews of major initiatives and ways to find out more about them. The 10 programs included were selected because they involve, or plan to involve, many schools and education systems across the country. Because of their ambitious scope, these approaches have received enough recognition to be mentioned when policy makers, business leaders, educators or citizens begin conversations about how to improve their education systems. They are not, by far, the only worthwhile efforts under way.

Why is there so much interest in fundamentally changing our education system? Why not just tune up the present system?

There are four main reasons why fundamental, comprehensive redesign of the states' school systems is needed:

- **New types of students.** Today's schools are serving a more diverse population than their current design effectively allows.
- **New social and economic demands.** The American economy has changed rapidly. A rapidly changing job market calls for new kinds of knowledge, skills and attitudes and much higher levels of literacy than ever before. Complex social problems call for new forms of citizen participation in community, state and national affairs. Much of what schools teach is unrelated to the world students must enter.
- **New knowledge about learning.** In the last 30 years, researchers have learned much about the nature of human learning that throws into question a number of current educational practices. Research shows, for instance, that learning should be an active, engaging, collaborative process. Many schools, however, make learning a passive, unengaging, isolated experience. Evidence shows that all children can learn whatever they are motivated to learn and are given the right opportunities to learn. But much of contemporary schooling rests on the outdated assumption that only a few students have the intelligence to do high-level work.
- **The current education system is not producing satisfactory results.** Evidence abounds that unacceptably large proportions of students do not know what they need to succeed in the future, do not understand much of what they learn in school, cannot apply that knowledge in their daily lives, do not respect learning and have not learned how to learn. There is also evidence that disproportionate numbers of poor and minority young people receive educations of little benefit to them or society.

When an important organization or system appears to be out of touch with its customers, focusing on the wrong things, uninformed by research, producing unsatisfactory results and changing very slowly, its fundamental design will come under scrutiny. This is what is happening to American education.

What do the terms "restructuring" and "system change" really mean?

In this guide, *restructuring* applies to any effort to change the fundamental structure of the education system in order to create conditions in which all students can achieve at higher levels. The structure includes such elements as curriculum, teaching, testing, management, budget, schedules, roles and responsibilities, relationships, incentives and other practices, policies and procedures that define school and district working environments.

Advocates of restructuring define the desired results in many ways, but in general the results wanted are:

- **Far greater student learning** in terms of what students learn, how well they understand what they learn and how well they can apply their knowledge in, outside of and beyond school
- **Vastly different roles and working conditions** for teachers to bring about greater learning for students
- **Major shifts in leadership, administration and community relations** to bring about those changes in teaching and learning
- **New forms of education policy, politics and coalitions** to create and sustain environments in which innovation, continuous improvement and a focus on quality are the rules, not the exceptions.

System change emphasizes the idea that school restructuring will not succeed unless all parts of the system — school, district, state — are redesigned simultaneously. Changing the system involves redesigning, for example, roles of school board members, those on the state board and staff in the state education department.

What principles, ideas and features do the restructuring initiatives in this guide share?

- People in and around the schools *ask hard questions about conventional practices*. They question, for instance, the practice of grouping students by age and so-called "ability," the separation of subjects such as reading, writing and mathematics from the rest of the curriculum, how schools involve parents, how they use time and how they define and measure progress.
- The initiatives are based on *visions* of the learning environments needed to help students reach new goals. The specifics of how and what is changed in a school system is derived from those visions.
- The initiatives *focus on learning*, especially active, hands-on learning. Adults are seen as learners, too, whether they are parents, as in James Comer's School Development Program (SDP); teachers, as in the National Education Association's (NEA) Mastery in Learning Project; or community leaders, as in Re:Learning (see descriptions inside for more information on these efforts).

- Initiatives in this guide assume that *all children can learn* whatever they are motivated to learn and are given appropriate time and opportunities to learn.
- All aim to get students *thinking and solving problems* in new ways. In SDP schools, for example, students learn to think about the differences between their home values and the values that prevail in school. In Paideia schools and those in the Coalition of Essential Schools network, students learn to think in Socratic discussions about fundamental human concerns.
- All the initiatives require *new concepts of what teachers are and do*. Teachers are seen as the central actors in making any significant changes, and their latitude for making decisions, collaborating with parents and trying new things is greatly expanded. Such changes bring about *new roles for administrators* and more *school autonomy* than usually exists in current systems.

What are the major differences between these initiatives?

- Initiatives vary by *level of schooling* they address. For instance, Stanford's Accelerated schools and the Montessori public schools focus on the elementary-school level. On the other hand, most schools in the Coalition of Essential Schools and Re:Learning are high schools.
- Some initiatives, including SDP and Accelerated schools, *target* special "at-risk" *populations*; others do not.
- Approaches differ in the degree and kind of *teacher preparation and training required*. Montessori schools, for instance, require highly specialized training obtainable only from specialized trainers and institutes. The Foxfire network offers extensive workshops for teachers, and NEA's Mastery in Learning connects its teachers by computer so they can broaden their knowledge of best practice.
- Initiatives vary in the amount and kind of *community involvement* they invite. SDP and Accelerated schools require intensive parental involvement; other approaches welcome it in various degrees, but do not focus on it.
- Initiatives vary with respect to *curriculum* focus. Montessori public schools have a very specific curriculum built upon theories of child development. Accelerated schools, Success for All schools and Whole Language schools focus on research-based language, literacy and story-telling ideas. Essential schools aim to move the curriculum away from an emphasis on memorizing facts toward an emphasis on "essential questions." Foxfire schools tend to use the traditions of the local community as a focus for curriculum.
- Differences also exist with respect to *testing and assessment*. Essential and Re:Learning schools downplay standardized examinations, requiring instead "exhibitions," "performances" and portfolios for proof that students have learned and understand content. Other initiatives gauge progress with standardized tests or leave assessment choices up to participating school faculties.
- Finally, considerable differences exist with respect to *direct attention to policy* and politics. Re:Learning schools and districts work for changes in district and state policy that will lead to a political climate supportive of long-term reform. Teachers in the NEA network examine policies that affect working conditions and learning environments. Other approaches pay less attention to system influences, trusting that policy and politics will evolve along supportive lines as schools are restructured.

Although the above generalizations hold true for the most part, it is important to point out that *schools within each initiative can vary greatly*. All the initiatives, however, invite participants to tailor their approaches to local needs, conditions and resources. No two Foxfire, Essential or Accelerated schools are exactly alike, and that is perfectly compatible with the values undergirding the initiatives. The whole idea is to free up innovation and capitalize on diversity.

School and system redesign in America may be desired at "the top" — by the president, governors and corporate leaders — but it can only become reality if the people at "the bottom" take responsibility for making it happen as they, in their continuing, creative, community conversations, see fit.

We invite you to read the descriptions in this guide to better understand what restructuring means and how it may look different from place to place. Words in boldface are explained in the glossary to aid your understanding.

Then, we invite you to read the materials noted and address further questions about the initiatives to the contact people listed. We hope this guide will be of use as you learn more about restructuring the education system. Though the information is presented approach-by-approach, it is not meant to suggest adoption of a particular approach(es). Your job as a leader of the education system is to develop a reform strategy in which the best ideas and approaches work together, tailored to the individual needs of your state or district.

Rexford Brown
executive director, State System Change Initiatives

Bob Palaich
director of policy studies

Martha Lederer
research assistant, Policy and the Higher Literacies Project

Andrea Paolino
research assistant, System Change Initiative

COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS (CES)

Theodore R. Sizer, Chairperson
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island

What is the history of this program?

- The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) was established at Brown University in 1984 by Theodore R. Sizer with 12 schools as members.
- Nine Common Principles guide the work of Essential schools. The principles were developed out of Sizer's "A Study of High Schools" (1979-1983), reported in *Horace's Compromise: the Dilemma of the American High School* and two other volumes.
- CES focuses primarily on improving education at the secondary-school level.

What beliefs guide this program?

- The function of every school is to help students use their minds well. Nine common principles were developed from this belief to guide activities in schools. Those principles are:
  - Schools should have an intellectual focus.
  - Schools should have simple goals; each student should master a limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge.
  - Schools should have universal goals that apply to all students.
  - Schools should strive to personalize teaching and learning as much as possible.
  - The governing metaphor of the school should be "student-as-worker."
  - Diplomas should be awarded upon a successful demonstration or **exhibition** of mastery.
  - The tone of the school (attitude) should explicitly and self-consciously stress values of unanxious expectation, trust and decency.
  - The principal and teachers (staff) should perceive themselves as generalists first and specialists second (experts in one particular discipline).
  - Ultimate administrative and budget targets should include, in addition to total student loads per teacher of 80 or fewer pupils, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff and an ultimate per-pupil cost not to exceed that at traditional schools by 10%.

What are the goals of this program?

- Help students acquire the habits of mind that allow them to question and reason by the time they leave high school.
- Create an intellectual atmosphere of personalized instruction in which students are encouraged to assume responsibility for their own learning.

How is this program implemented?

- Since 1988, CES has been in partnership with the Education Commission of the States (ECS) in an effort called Re:Learning. (Please see Re:Learning summary). Schools wanting to join CES must be in participating states.
- Schools go through three phases in order to join CES:
  - Faculties of "exploring schools" enter into a period of reading and study to understand the nine Common Principles and their implications for school change and to determine if they want to proceed with developing an Essential school plan.
  - "Networking schools" have determined that they wish to proceed with developing a plan to adapt the nine Common Principles.
  - "Essential schools" have officially joined CES. Their faculties are putting into practice programs based on the nine Common Principles.

- CES provides a variety of support to networking and Essential schools: publications, an annual meeting, workshops, professional development institutes and on-site work with school faculties. Each participating school is encouraged to design or restructure its own curriculum, taking into account the community's cultural make-up and other factors.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- CES does not recommend any specific practices. It does, however, make suggestions regarding the number of subjects taught in Essential schools and the general nature of teacher approaches.
- Teachers teach fewer topics more completely and are not bound to a given textbook.
- Students work to master essential skills and knowledge, rather than merely "cover content."
- Teachers evaluate student progress using a variety of assessments, including oral presentations, tests, written reports, essay exams and portfolios of collected works.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Teachers are facilitators of learning instead of deliverers of knowledge.
- Teachers and administrators share teaching, administrative and counseling duties.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- Preliminary data on this research-based initiative suggest improvement in graduation rates, attendance and achievement on conventional tests and a decline in discipline referrals in Essential schools.
- A long-range assessment project is being implemented.
- Schools are expected to monitor and report their progress.

Where is the program operating?

- More than 180 schools across the country participate in CES.

How is the program funded?

- The coalition has received funds from Aetna Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, Citibank, Danforth Foundation, Exxon Education Foundation, IBM, Kraft General Foods, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Pew Charitable Trusts, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Southwestern Bell Foundation, Xerox, an anonymous donor and many other contributors.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- Per-pupil costs vary from school to school. CES emphasizes the reallocation of existing budgets to implement its program.
- Professional development and planning time account for most additional costs of the program.

For more information, read:

Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School, Theodore R. Sizer. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985.

The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace, Arthur G. Powell, Eleanor Farrar and David K. Cohen. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985.

The Last Little Citadel: American High Schools Since 1940, Robert Hampel. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986.

For more information, contact:

Lisa Lasky, Manager, Information Center
Coalition of Essential Schools, Brown University
One Davol Square
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
401-863-3384

FOXFIRE

The Foxfire Center
Rabun Gap, Georgia

What is the history of this program?

- Foxfire began in 1966 with the efforts of high school teacher Eliot Wigginton to stimulate his students' interest in language and learning.
- One of Wigginton's English classes decided to produce a quarterly magazine, *Foxfire*, for and about their community, Rabun Gap, Georgia.
- In 1972, Doubleday published a selection of articles from the magazine in book form.
- Approximately 200 student magazines, modeled on Foxfire, sprang up in communities throughout the country over the next several years.
- Foxfire established five Teacher Outreach Centers to train teachers in the Foxfire approach.
- Eleven Foxfire-affiliated teacher networks operate across the country. (1991)

What beliefs guide this program?

- People learn best when education builds on previous experience.
- The work teachers and students do together must flow from student desires and concerns.
- School work must be connected to the surrounding community and to the real world.
- Student work must have an audience beyond the teacher.

What are the goals of this program?

- For students:
  - Help students become willing and able participants in their own education.
  - Develop students' understanding of community and culture.
  - Support teamwork and democratic process in the classroom.
  - Facilitate analytical and reflective thought.
  - Enable students to take "measured risks" toward personal growth and intellectual development.
  - Advance the appreciation of imagination, reflection and aesthetic experience.
- For teachers in the Teacher Outreach Program:
  - Encourage and equip teachers to use the Foxfire approach in classroom instruction.

How is this program implemented?

- Foxfire does not portray itself as a "reform movement," but rather as an approach that can be implemented in almost any school structure.
- The Teacher Outreach Program works through "host institutions," mostly colleges and universities, that sponsor Foxfire courses and workshops and serve as home bases for the teacher networks.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- In Foxfire classrooms:
  - Students develop and work on projects and activities they consider relevant and important.
  - Programs often include students of mixed ages and ability levels.
  - Foxfire teachers use state and local curricula as guidelines. Specific content and method for each class varies according to student projects and needs.
  - Students examine and discuss what they are learning in "debriefing" sessions throughout activities and experiences.
  - Teachers assess student performance and needs continually to determine what each student has mastered and what areas need more attention.

- In teacher workshops:
  - Workshop instructors model the Foxfire approach.
  - Instructors give equal attention to the principles of the approach and the practicalities of implementing it.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Administrators help coordinate resources and create a school environment to make student-centered learning possible.
- Teachers model the flexibility, curiosity and attitudes expected of students.
- Teachers help students discover, define and pursue work students find worthwhile.
- The responsibility for education belongs to the whole community.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- For Foxfire classrooms:
  - Through a variety of assessments including project debriefings, student portfolios and performances, standardized tests, course objectives checkoffs, parent commentaries and anecdotal records of the course and students.
- For the Teacher Outreach Program:
  - By tracking the degree to which teachers implement the Foxfire approach in their classes.

Where is the program operating?

- Foxfire programs operate in approximately 1,000 classrooms in urban, suburban and rural schools across the country.
- Foxfire Teacher Networks operate in Illinois, Kentucky, Washington, Maine, New York, Georgia, Idaho, Tennessee and West Virginia. Foxfire initiatives are beginning in Florida and Nevada (1991).

How is the program funded?

- Primary funding in Rabun County comes from an endowment created by Foxfire book sales.
- The Foxfire Fund and Foxfire Teacher Outreach Program have received grants from many foundations, including Appalachian Regional Commission, Apple Computer, Inc., Mr. Bingham's Trust for Charity, Coca-Cola Foundation, DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, W.R. Hearst Foundation, Charles Loridans Foundation, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and Public Welfare Foundation.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- There is no additional per-pupil cost for implementing Foxfire.

For more information, read:

Sometimes a Shining Moment, Eliot Wigginton. New York: Doubleday, 1985.

"Foxfire Grows Up," Eliot Wigginton, *Harvard Educational Review*, 59:1, February 1989.

"Foxfire Teacher Networks," Hilton Smith, *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives (2nd Edition)*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991.

For more information, contact:

Kim Cannon, Outreach Assistant
Foxfire Teacher Outreach
P.O. Box B
Rabun Gap, Georgia 30568
404-746-5318

THE MASTERY IN LEARNING CONSORTIUM

Robert M. McClure, Director
NEA National Center For Innovation
Washington, D.C.

What is the history of this program?

- The Mastery in Learning Consortium is one of four programs in the National Education Association (NEA) Center for Innovation. The consortium, begun in 1990, is the successor to the Mastery in Learning Project, initiated in 1985.
- The consortium helps school communities transform their schools based on the best that is known about teaching, learning, curriculum and how these interrelate to define the school.
- Central to these improvement efforts is the IBM/NEA School Renewal Network, which connects schools to one another and to a database that is being developed by researchers and teachers in schools engaged in restructuring.

What beliefs guide this program?

- Considerable knowledge is available to guide school improvement efforts.
- No single, patented formula defines the improvement necessary for all schools.
- Local faculty must play the central role in designing the reform agenda for their school.
- The building of collegiality among school staff is critical to school improvement.
- Learning, teaching and curriculum are the central priorities of any school.
- Every student can master subject matter, given enough time and the right resources.

What are the goals of this program?

- Enable faculties and communities to challenge the norms in their schools.
- Provide faculties with access to current information about teaching, learning, curriculum and school climate and to exemplars of good practice.
- Enable students to achieve mastery in learning (defined as acquired depth in subject matter) and the ability to see interrelationships, solve problems and locate, organize and apply knowledge.
- Enable faculty to achieve mastery in teaching (defined as a command of knowledge and skills through education), confidence, judgment and strength.

How is this program implemented?

- The project facilitates restructuring in each school using a four-step process:
  - Step 1: School Profile. Mastery in Learning participants create a description of the school through interviews with teachers, students, parents and administrators. The profile touches on the academic program, teaching methods and styles, individuals' attitudes and other conditions that shape the working and learning environments.
  - Step 2: Faculty Inventory. This process helps teachers identify similarities and differences in their perceptions and priorities. It also addresses unresolved issues and communication problems through a series of group activities.
  - Step 3: Empowerment. During this phase, the faculty explores approaches to teaching and learning using the project's databases.
  - Step 4: Comprehensive Change. The faculty develops, implements and documents a school improvement plan based on current knowledge and priorities established during the three previous steps.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- Because curriculum and teaching methods are determined by the faculty, these vary from school to school. All schools focus on high standards for students and relevant measures of their performance.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Teachers, principals and other faculty members use research and other knowledge as they work collaboratively to make decisions regarding school climate, instructional programs, teaching assignments, curriculum, goals and assessment.
- Parents contribute to the initial assessment of the school. This serves as a benchmark to chart project efforts. They may be involved in other ways as changes in school structure and administration take place.
- Principals provide instructional leadership and convey high expectations for students and staff.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- Through before and after comparisons of student attendance, parent satisfaction surveys, student surveys about attitudes related to school, teacher satisfaction and data on student achievement.
- Through case studies and anecdotal records of how the faculty works together and in what ways research and other information become more central to their decision-making processes.
- Through timelines that chart the community's progress in restructuring its school.

Where is the program operating?

- In six communities: Austin, Texas; Riverside, California; Seattle, Washington; Wells, Maine; Manhattan, Kansas; and Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

How is the program funded?

- Funding is provided by the National Education Association and participating school districts. Each school also secures additional funds to support faculty and community participation through business partners, state departments of education and/or through local or state foundations.

What does the program cost per pupil?

Per-pupil costs vary from site to site depending on the particular improvement initiative.

For more information, read:

Teachers and Research in Action, Carol Livingston and Shari Castle, eds. Washington, D.C.: NEA Professional Library, 1989.

"Individual Growth and Institutional Development," Robert M. McClure, *Staff Development for Education in the 1990s*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991, in press.

"From Tinkering to Transformation: Faculty Leadership in School Change," *Mind Matters*, Palatine, Ill.: Skylight Publishing, 1991.

For more information, contact:

Robert M. McClure, Director
Sylvia Seidel, Assistant Director
NEA Mastery in Learning Consortium
The NEA National Center for Innovation
1201 16th St. NW
Washington, DC 20036-3290
(202) 822-7783

MONTESSORI IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Montessori Public School Consortium
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

What is the history of this program?

- The Montessori method derives from Maria Montessori's work with retarded and impoverished children in Italy beginning around 1900.
- Montessori's first school, opened in 1907 in the slums near Rome, attempted to provide an environment in which children from illiterate families could learn at least as well as their counterparts from more privileged circumstances.
- The school quickly became a model of alternative education, as Montessori's ideas spread throughout Europe and North America. By 1912, more than 100 Montessori schools were in operation in the United States.
- "Mainstream" American educators alternatively embraced and rejected the Montessori method over the course of this century. Montessori schools evolved predominantly as private institutions prior to the 1980s.
- In 1988, Cleveland State University, the North American Montessori Teachers' Association and Nienhuis Group, Inc. developed the Montessori Public School Consortium to serve as a clearinghouse and to provide research and support for implementing the Montessori method in public schools.

What beliefs guide this program?

- Human intelligence is greatly influenced by environment, rather than being "fixed" from birth.
- Children have a spontaneous interest in learning.
- Certain, identifiable stages of intellectual development exist in children for which there should be corresponding educational environments.
- Children display "sensitive periods" during which they are absorbed in a particular learning task (such as learning to talk or walk).
- Children learn independently, using the components of their environment and manipulating objects as learning tools.

What are the goals of this program?

- Aid the development of the mental, spiritual and physical personality of the child.
- Cultivate individualization, freedom of choice and independence.
- Facilitate social interaction.
- Develop concentration, problem-solving abilities and competence in basic skills.

How is this program implemented?

- Many public school districts operate Montessori "magnet" schools.
- The North American Montessori Teachers' Association publishes 10 steps to implementing Montessori in the public sector. These relate to: teacher training, program phase-in, equipment, curriculum, goals, evaluation and reporting, and parent involvement.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- Montessori programs group children in multi-age clusters: preschool, ages 3-6+; Elementary I, ages 6-9; Elementary II, ages 9-12.
- The preschool program includes practical life, sensorial, mathematics, language arts and cultural curricula. Elementary levels build on the preceding program.
- Classrooms are "prepared environments" containing age-appropriate materials: books, blocks, models, puzzles, beads, balances, picture cards, musical instruments and many other learning tools designed to develop particular knowledge and skills.
- Children usually choose their own activities, work independently, repeat or order activities as they wish and progress at their own pace. Group activities take the form of discussions, projects or games.
- Teachers generally interact with one child at a time.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Montessori-trained adults are viewed as "enlightened generalists," who provide a link between the child and the environment.
- Teachers work in pairs.
- Teachers observe and respond to what children are doing, rather than present lessons or address the whole class.
- A professionally trained Montessori supervisor oversees the development, coordination and implementation of the program within a school and district.
- Parents participate in orientations, open houses, discussion groups, workshops, classroom observations, fundraisers and the publication of parent newsletters.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- On-site evaluation conducted by Montessori specialists and district personnel.
- Standardized achievement tests used by the district.
- Internal assessment based on Montessori objectives.
- Evaluation of parent satisfaction, parent participation, waiting lists, etc.
- Follow-up studies of graduated students.

Where is the program operating?

- In approximately 90 public schools across the United States and Canada.
- In approximately 3,000 American private schools and in public and private schools throughout the world.

How is the program funded?

- Funding for the Montessori Public School Consortium comes in part from the Cleveland Foundation, North American Montessori Teachers' Association, Cleveland State University and Nienhuis Group, Inc.

What does the program cost?

- $12,000 per class (one time) for stock materials
- $5,000-$10,000 training per teacher
- $750 inservice training per teacher
- $2,000 consultation per year
- $2,100 per pupil, after initial investments

For more information, read:

The Absorbent Mind, Maria Montessori. New York: Holt, Rineholt and Winston, 1967

Implementing Montessori in the Public Sector, David Kahn, ed. Cleveland: North American Montessori Teachers' Association.

For more information, contact:

David Kahn
North American Montessori Teachers' Association
11424 Bellflower Road NE
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118
(216) 421-1905 FAX 216-421-8193

THE PAIDEIA PROGRAM

Peter J. Neary, Executive Director
National Paideia Center
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

What is the history of this program?

- "Paideia" comes from the Greek word *paidos*, meaning "the upbringing of a child."
- The Paideia Program originated with the 1982 publication of *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*, by Mortimer Adler.
- The book summarized concerns a committee of 21 distinguished American educators had about the declining quality of public education and outlined their ideas for reforming the nation's schools.
- Through the 1980s, Adler and others conducted seminars and workshops throughout the country to train teachers and administrators in Paideia principles and practices.
- The National Paideia Center at the University of Carolina at Chapel Hill was established in 1991.

What beliefs guide this program?

- Universal, quality education is essential to democracy.
- Basic schooling should consist of a nonspecialized course of study.
- Schooling should prepare people to be life-long learners.
- **"Tracking"** is harmful and discriminatory: "the best education for the best is the best education for all."
- All children are educable, not merely trainable.

What are the goals of this program?

- Prepare students to take advantage of opportunities for personal growth and self-improvement.
- Prepare students to exercise the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.
- Prepare students to earn a living.

How is this program implemented?

- The National Paideia Center establishes model schools, directs professional development and provides technical assistance for Paideia schools.
- Some schools adopt Paideia principles and practices on a schoolwide basis, while others implement a Paideia **school-within-a-school**.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- The required course of study consists of language, literature, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, history, geography and social studies.
- Elective classes are limited to four auxiliary subjects, including physical education and a second language.
- The course of study is arranged in three "columns," which correspond to three ways the mind can be improved:
  - By the acquisition of organized knowledge.
  - By the development of intellectual skills.
  - By the enlargement of understanding, insight and aesthetic appreciation.
- Teaching and learning methods relate to each of these columns. Methods include **didactic instruction**, coaching, exercises and supervised instruction, and **Socratic questioning** during regular Paideia seminars.
- Teachers have specific training in Paideia philosophy and methods in addition to general college education.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Teachers operate as instructors, lecturers, coaches and discussion facilitators, according to the mode and content of learning.
- Principals function as instructional leaders. They also have authority over the hiring and firing of school staff, job promotions and assignments, and rules of conduct governing schools.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- Interviews and discussions with project and school staff, parents and students.
- Review of documents, **criterion-referenced tests**, logs and related project records.
- Other indicators such as behavior incident reports, attendance records, college entrance statistics, advanced-placement records and selected standardized tests, where available and appropriate.

Where is the program operating?

- Paideia principles have been adopted in over 200 schools throughout the country.

How is this program funded?

- The National Paideia Center receives support from the University of North Carolina and the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- Schools incur no special costs related to the implementation of Paideia.

For more information, read:

The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto, Mortimer J. Adler, on behalf of the members of the Paideia Group. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc, 1982.

Paideia Problems and Possibilities, Mortimer J. Adler. New York: MacMillan, 1983.

Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus, Mortimer J. Adler. New York: MacMillan, 1984.

For more information, contact:

Anne Giles, Administrative Assistant
National Paideia Center
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Campus Box 8045
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599
919-962-7379

RE:LEARNING

Edwin Campbell, Executive Director
Coalition of Essential Schools
Providence, Rhode Island

What is the history of this program?

- Re:Learning is a joint effort of the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) and the Education Commission of the States (ECS), established in the summer of 1988.
- CES works directly with schools to improve the way they educate students.
- ECS works with policy makers, districts, departments of education and states to improve the regulatory and policy climate in which schools operate.
- The Re:Learning partnership helps participating states transform all parts of the education system.

What beliefs guide this program?

- Both education policy and practice must be built on contemporary research about effective student learning and systemic change, rather than merely continuing traditional patterns.
- State and district policies must support and encourage site-based school reforms if they are to succeed and thrive. Restructuring must take place "from the schoolhouse to the statehouse."
- School redesign efforts must focus on the primary purpose of schooling – to help all students learn to use their minds well.
- Nine Common Principles drive the change effort. (See Coalition of Essential Schools description for principles.)
- School reform must be comprehensive and systemic if it is to be effective and lasting.

What are the goals of this program?

- Stimulate and support redesign work at the school, district, state and national levels.

How is this program implemented?

- The Re:Learning partnership identifies active states either as Networking States or Re:Learning States:
  - Networking status requires an expressed willingness on the part of the governor's office, the state department of education, districts and schools to explore ways in which the nine Common Principles may be adapted for the state education system. This process lasts from one to several years. The governor and the chief state school officer must jointly apply for networking status.
  - Re:Learning states are those that support schools actively incorporating the nine Common Principles and which have established a leadership group to focus on restructuring the full education system. The governor and chief state school officer must jointly apply for Re:Learning status.
- At least five schools within a Re:Learning state participate in the program; however, because the effort focuses on restructuring education systems, schools may only join Re:Learning in Re:Learning states.
- Because school and system change is hard work, Re:Learning requires states to participate in the effort for a minimum of five years and make a financial commitment to the effort.
- The Re:Learning staff provides training, support and assistance with policy, practice and communications for participating states.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- Curriculum and instruction in participating schools are guided by the nine Common Principles. School faculties, with district and state support, rethink and redesign their curriculum, pedagogy and assessment, tailored to their students and community.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- Preliminary data suggest improvement in graduation rates, attendance, achievement rates on conventional tests, increased applications to higher education institutions and a decline in discipline referrals in schools participating in Re:Learning.
- A long-range assessment project is being implemented.
- In each state, a leadership group annually reviews the progress of the state and participating districts and schools.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Teachers are facilitators of learning instead of deliverers of knowledge.
- Teachers and administrators share teaching, administrative and counseling duties.
- Re:Learning encourages parents and other community members to participate in the redesign of the school system.

Where is the program operating?

- Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, New Mexico, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island are Re:Learning states. Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota and Missouri are networking states. (1991)

How is the program funded?

- Each participating state pledges financial support from public and private monies to help fund Re:Learning activities at school, district and state levels.
- Re:Learning has received funds from Aetna Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, Citibank, Danforth Foundation, Exxon Education Foundation, Gates Foundation, IBM, Joyce Foundation, Kraft General Foods, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Pew Charitable Trusts, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Southwestern Bell Foundation, Xerox, an anonymous donor and many other contributors.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- Re:Learning emphasizes the reallocation of existing budgets in order to implement the program at minimal additional cost – generally less than 10% above average annual costs.
- Teacher inservice and planning time account for most additional costs of the program.

For more information, read:

Reformation of the Full Education System, Beverly Anderson. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1989.

"Re:Learning Resource Packet." Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1991.

Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School, Theodore R. Sizer. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985

"Educational Policy and the Essential School," *Horace*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Coalition of Essential Schools, January 1990.

For more information, contact:

Susan Klein, State Support Coordinator
Education Commission of the States
707 17th Street, Suite 2700
Denver, Colorado 80202-3427
(303) 299-3648

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

James P. Comer, Director
Yale Child Study Center
New Haven, Connecticut

What is the history of this program?

- The School Development Program (SDP) began as a collaborative venture between the Yale Child Study Center and the New Haven School System in 1968.
- SDP was probably the first school improvement initiative to incorporate **collaborative decision making, site-based management** and fully integrated parent and mental health team activities.
- SDP focuses on public elementary schools, particularly those serving inner-city, minority and low-income children.

What beliefs guide this program?

- The elementary school is where children develop the skills, attitudes and habits that influence their achievement for the remainder of their lives.
- All children can learn regardless of their background.
- The sources of most learning and behavior problems are conflicts of class, race, income and culture between children's home and school environments — not children themselves.
- Excellent schools require a climate of trust, cooperation and caring among teachers, students, parents and the community.
- Students understand concepts best when they experience them.

What are the goals of this program?

- Address the causes, as well as the symptoms, of student failure.
- Support the physical, emotional and intellectual growth of all students.
- Bridge the gap that occurs when attitudes, values and behaviors children develop at home are different from those valued at school.
- Create a structured, predictable school environment in which faculty and parents communicate clear expectations for behavior and academic performance.

How is this program implemented?

- Parents, administrators, faculty and mental health professionals together assume responsibility for administering the SDP.
- Each school establishes its own Governance and Management Team, which designs a comprehensive building plan to address school climate, curriculum, assessment and staff development.
- A Mental Health Team at each SDP school advises teachers and works to identify and prevent behavior problems.
- Each school has a Parent Participation Program.
- Teachers attend regular inservice workshops on issues related to the SDP.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- The curriculum incorporates five basic units: "politics of the system," the arts, free/leisure time, health/nutrition and social skills.
- Teachers use techniques that promote **experiential learning**.
- Faculty design materials and draw activities from students' own backgrounds and cultures.
- Lessons emphasize social skills and relationships, such as courtesy and negotiation, in addition to building students' intellectual capacities.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- All of the adults who come into contact with students serve as "surrogate parents"; they model desirable behaviors and attend to students' non-academic thoughts, fears and concerns as well as teach academic material.
- In addition to serving on the Governance and Management Team, parents work as volunteers or part-time employees in classrooms and participate in a variety of school activities.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- The New Haven schools in which SDP was first developed were ranked worst in the city on achievement test scores, staff morale and attendance 20 years ago; today they consistently rank among the top four schools in these areas.
- Numerous studies conducted by the Yale Child Study Center to date show SDP:
  - Has positive effects on school climate and student outcomes.
  - Increases students' self-concept ratings.
  - Reduces absenteeism and the number of suspension days.
  - Increases scores in reading, math and in the total battery on the California Achievement Test.

Where is the program operating?

- Schools in New Haven, Connecticut; Lee County, Arkansas; Prince George's County, Maryland; Washington, D.C.; Berrien County, Michigan; Norfolk, Virginia; Leavenworth, Kansas; and others have adopted the School Development Program.

How is the program funded ?

- Begun by a grant from the Ford Foundation, the School Development Program is now funded by the Rockefeller Foundation.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- Only existing personnel are used; therefore, only minimal initial training costs are involved.

For more information, read:

School Power: Implications Of An Intervention Project, James P. Comer. New York: Free Press, 1980.

Maggie's American Dream, James P. Comer. New York: Plume Books, 1988

"Educating Poor Minority Children," James P. Comer, *Scientific American*, November 1988.

For more information, contact:

James Comer
Yale Child Study Center
P.O. Box 3333
230 S. Frontage Road
New Haven, CT 06510
203-785-2548

THE STANFORD ACCELERATED SCHOOLS PROJECT

Henry M. Levin, Director
Stanford University
Stanford, California

What is the history of this program?

- The Accelerated Schools model developed out of an educational research project at Stanford University in the early 1980s that addressed the demography and educational outcomes of **at-risk** students and the record of success for school improvement efforts.
- The Accelerated Schools model was designed as a systemwide approach to education reform.
- Two model schools were chosen to implement the Accelerated Schools model during the 1986–1987 school year. The number of participating schools had grown to 54 by 1990.

What beliefs guide this program?

- All children can learn.
- Schools should **accelerate**, not **remediate**, students.
- At-risk students often show talents in areas not traditionally valued in school and possess knowledge unique to their cultures.
- At-risk students must learn at faster rates than their more advantaged peers to eliminate the **achievement gap** that exists between them.
- Many conventional schooling practices, such as **tracking or ability grouping**, teacher-dominated instruction and standardized testing fail to **empower** at-risk students to learn to their full capacities.

What are the goals of this program?

- Enable at-risk students to benefit from **mainstream education**.
- Bring disadvantaged students into the educational mainstream by the end of 6th grade.
- Close the gap in standardized test scores and **grade-level promotion** between at-risk and more advantaged students.
- Teach at-risk students the way gifted and talented students are taught.

How is this program implemented?

- It takes about six years to fully implement an accelerated school. Implementation requires:
  - Establishing a unity of purpose among staff, parents, students and the community.
  - Identifying and building on the strengths of students, staff and parents.
  - Creating the capacity for school-site decisions regarding resource allocation, instructional strategies, curriculum, materials and personnel selection.
  - Establishing a problem-solving process for making informed decisions.
  - Changing the way resources are allocated within school districts from allocating funds to **pull-out programs** (not including those serving children with severe impairments) to investing in overall programs that involve all children in a faster-paced, more engaging curriculum.
  - Freeing up time for faculties to study, plan, make decisions and explore alternatives.
  - Decreasing the emphasis on compliance with "top-down" rules, regulations and mandates.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- Classes generally consist of students of mixed abilities.
- Accelerated Schools use a **language-based approach** for all subjects, even math. This model stresses reading, writing, speaking and listening.
- Lessons emphasize analysis, synthesis, problem solving and application in all subjects.
- Presentations demonstrate the connections between academic material and students' daily lives.
- Teachers use **active-learning techniques**, such as **peer tutoring** and **cooperative learning**.
- Students work on projects requiring resources outside the classroom to develop independence, self-reliance and self-confidence.

- Students complete periodic evaluations, standardized achievement tests and assessments created by school staff for each area of the curriculum.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Accelerated schools involve faculty, staff and parents at three levels:
  - In cadres, or work groups, that focus on specific issues or school concerns.
  - On the steering committee, which coordinates efforts of the cadres and brings recommendations to the school as a whole.
  - At meetings of the school-as-a-whole, which establish the vision and priorities of the school.
- Parents sign a written agreement that clarifies goals of the Accelerated School and identifies obligations of parents, faculty and students in achieving them.
- Faculty share increased accountability and responsibility for decisions regarding teaching and learning, governance, budget and school policy.
- The principal guides the overall progress of the school and coordinates opportunities to use school talent to accelerate learning.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- Student performance on standardized tests, portfolios of student work, student and staff attendance, parental participation, reductions in student transfers.

Where is the program operating?

- 54 schools in California, Illinois, Missouri, Louisiana, Texas and Washington State in 1990-91. More than 100 schools in these five states, plus schools in Connecticut, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Arizona, Michigan and Wisconsin will participate in 1991-92.

How is the program funded?

- Funding comes primarily from local sources through reallocations from existing budgets for staff development. Local foundations also provide small grants.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- Approximately $30 per student per year with some variance.

For more information, read:

"Accelerating the Progress of All Students," Henry M. Levin, *Rockefeller Institute Special Report Number 31*. Albany: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, State University of New York at Albany, 1991.

"Accelerated Schools for the Disadvantaged," Henry M. Levin, *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 44, No. 6, March 1987, pp. 19-21.

"New Schools for the Disadvantaged," Henry M. Levin, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 4, Fall 1987, pp. 60-83.

For more information, contact:

Henry M. Levin, Director
Stanford Accelerated Schools Project
402 S. CERAS
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-3084
415-723-0840

SUCCESS FOR ALL

Robert E. Slavin, Principal Research Scientist
Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

What is the history of this program?

- The Success for All Program grew out of a partnership between the Baltimore City Public Schools and the Center for Research in Elementary and Middle Schools (CREMS) at The Johns Hopkins University.
- Baltimore's school board president and superintendent challenged the research team at CREMS to develop a program that would enable every child in an inner-city Baltimore elementary school to perform at grade level by the end of grade 3.
- Success for All was first implemented in a pilot school during the 1987-1988 school year.
- Several other Baltimore public elementary schools have since adopted Success for All.

What beliefs guide this program?

- Every child can learn.
- Success in early grades is critical for future success in school.
- Prevention, early intervention, improved classroom methods, individual attention, family support and other strategies must be used to address problems students have both inside and outside the classroom.
- The most widely used strategies for disadvantaged students, remedial **"pull-out" programs**, don't work.
- Effective school reform programs are both comprehensive and intensive.

What are the goals of this program?

- Ensure that every student will perform at grade level in reading, writing and mathematics at the end of the 3rd grade.
- Reduce the number of students referred to special education classes.
- Reduce the number of students who are held back to repeat a grade.
- Increase attendance.

How is this program implemented?

- Each Success for All school has a program facilitator who coordinates schedules and activities.
- Each school has up to six reading tutors who work individually with students.
- A Family Support Team, made up of staff such as social workers, parent liaisons and counselors, educates and assists families in matters related to school readiness, such as attendance, health and nutrition.
- The program usually provides half-day preschool and full-day kindergarten.
- Success for All schools provide health services for students once a week.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- Preschool and kindergarten emphasize oral language, thematic units and story telling.
- The reading curriculum focuses on oral language, comprehension and word-attack skills.
- Students in grades 1, 2 and 3 are grouped together for much of the school day and are regrouped for 90-minute reading periods each day.
- Success for All uses **cooperative learning** strategies.
- Students who lack a sufficient grasp of certain materials receive one-to-one tutoring by trained adult tutors.
- Reading teachers assess each student's progress every eight weeks to develop an academic plan for him/her and to determine whether he/she needs tutoring, health screening, etc.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Teachers take the lead in designing innovative approaches to improve achievement. Faculty assume responsibility for student learning.
- The program facilitator helps the principal with scheduling and frequently visits classes and tutoring sessions. The facilitator also coordinates the activities of the Family Support Team with instructional staff.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- The Advisory Committee (program facilitator, teacher representatives, a social worker and Johns Hopkins research staff) meets weekly to review program progress.
- Research scientists have conducted a series of assessments that indicate significant improvement in the test scores of students, especially those whose pretests placed them in the lowest quarter of their grades.
- Retentions and special education placements have been significantly reduced.

Where is the program operating?

- Several schools in Baltimore have adopted the program, in addition to schools in Philadelphia, Charleston, Montgomery, Memphis and elsewhere.

How is the program funded?

- Success for All receives Chapter 1 funding, plus financial support from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- Roughly $800 per child per year in addition to the district's standard per-pupil allotment.

For more information, read:

"Success for All," Nancy Madden, Robert Slavin, Nancy Karweit, Lawrence Dolan and Barbara Wasik, *Phi Delta Kappan*, April 1991, pp. 593-59

Success for All: Multi-Year Effects of a Schoolwide Elementary Restructuring Program, Nancy Madden, Robert Slavin, Nancy Karweit, Lawrence Dolan and Barbara Wasik. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, March 1991.

"Neverstreaming: Prevention and Early Intervention as an Alternative to Special Education," Nancy Madden, Robert Slavin, Nancy Karweit, Lawrence Dolan and Barbara Wasik, *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, in press.

For more information, contact:

Robert Slavin or Lawrence Dolan
Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
301-338-7570
FAX 301-338-6370

WHOLE LANGUAGE

Dorothy Watson, President
Whole Language Umbrella
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

What is the history of this program?

- Whole Language is a broadly defined curriculum reform movement that combines ideas gained from research in language acquisition, linguistics, cognition, child development, reading, writing and other related areas over the last several decades.
- The name "Whole Language" relates to the principle that children learn oral language quickly and instinctively, without having it broken up into isolated or abstract bits and pieces as is commonly done in grammar books and basal readers.
- Unlike other, more centralized reform initiatives, Whole Language is largely a grassroots movement among teachers.

What beliefs guide this program?

- Children acquire language naturally and developmentally, through real experience, rather than through direct teaching of language skills.
- Language and thinking are inseparable processes.
- Language learning should be child-centered rather than teacher-dominated.
- The classroom community is part of the greater community in which students and teachers live and communicate daily.
- Language is functional; it is a means to communication, rather than an end in itself.

What are the goals of this program?

- Enable students to gain and express knowledge effectively.
- Help students learn how to learn.
- Help students acquire and use problem-solving strategies.
- Develop in students an appreciation of language, literature and culture.

How is this program implemented?

- Whole Language may be implemented in individual classrooms or as a schoolwide curriculum approach.
- Because the methods and objectives of Whole Language are not consistent with standardized testing, it is most successful in schools that allow for alternative forms of student evaluation.
- Schoolwide implementation requires considerable staff support and is best accomplished incrementally to allow for:
  - Assessment of student needs.
  - Establishment of a focus and schoolwide goals.
  - Faculty training in Whole Language methods.
  - Accumulation of materials.

What is taught? How is it taught?

- Students read literature appropriate for their age and interests rather than basal readers or texts, in addition to a wide variety of other materials, such as articles, essays, poems, ads, signs, instructions, maps, newspapers and magazines.
- Students write daily, usually on self-selected topics.
- Writing instruction focuses on writing as a process of formulating ideas, communicating them with words and revising work as necessary for clarity and effectiveness.
- Students interview people, read aloud with partners, help each other edit and revise what they write, listen to and produce audio and video tapes, make presentations, take part in frequent class discussions and participate in a variety of other activities that develop their listening and speaking skills.

- Teachers evaluate students' progress primarily through observation as students read, write and speak. Teachers record their observations on checklists, inventories and in **anecdotal reports** and log books.
- Students complete regular self-evaluations of their progress.

What new role(s) do teachers, administrators and parents play?

- Administrators shift professional authority and responsibility to teachers; they encourage innovation, participate in and support collaborative decision making.
- Teachers operate primarily as resources, facilitators and observers, rather than language instructors.
- Parents pursue Whole Language activities with their children at home.

How is program effectiveness measured?

- Individual teachers evaluate the effectiveness of the Whole Language approach in their classrooms, based on various measures of student growth and learning.
- Teachers do not consider standardized test scores an accurate or appropriate measure of program success, because their nature, content and uses conflict with the goals, methods and curriculum of Whole Language.

Where is the program operating?

- Whole Language curricula are in place in schools in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand.

How is the program funded?

- Unlike many literacy programs, Whole Language has not been formally supported by any funding agency.

What does the program cost per pupil?

- Whole Language costs considerably less than literacy programs using basal readers and their auxiliary materials. Primary costs are associated with the purchase of high-quality literature, content area trade books, newspapers, maps, charts, etc.

For more information, read:

The Whole Language Catalog, Ken Goodman, Lois Bird and Yetta Goodman: American School Publishers, 1990.

Ideas and Insights, Dorothy Watson. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1987.

Elementary School Journal (on Whole Language), Vol. 90, 1989.

For more information, contact:

Orin Cochrane
14 Regula Place
Winnipeg, Manitoba
CANADA R2G 3C1
204-668-5480

Jerry Harste
Indiana University
211 Education
Bloomington, IN 47405
812-855-0300

GLOSSARY

Ability grouping

The practice of identifying and organizing students for instruction according to assumed similarities. Students may be grouped for all subjects or in particular areas, such as reading or math.

Similar to **"tracking."** Although students may be tracked in a particular subject area, "tracks" usually represent a total academic program, e.g., the "accelerated track" or the "remedial track." Tracks also gear education toward specific options after graduation, such as the "college-bound track" or the "vocational track."

Anecdotal report

A brief written entry or narrative describing an incident or behavior relative to the progress of a student or project. Some teachers may use anecdotal reports, for example, to record students' use of speech, writing or reasoning in order to characterize and assess language acquisition and proficiency. Others may log specific competencies as students demonstrate them, particularly skills that are difficult to test with conventional measures.

Accelerate

To increase the amount of academic material or learning opportunities to which students are exposed within a given period of time and/or the sophistication of knowledge and skills they are expected to master. Enrollment in accelerated classes (also known as "X-track" or "high" courses or programs) traditionally has been limited to students identified by IQ scores, standardized test scores and other measures as "exceptional" or "gifted."

Achievement gap

The common disparity in test scores, grade-point averages, enrollment in accelerated courses, graduation rates and other indicators of academic success that exists between advantaged and disadvantaged students and/or between Anglo and minority students.

Active learning

An approach to teaching and learning in which teachers present situations and ask questions intended to stimulate discussion and investigation, rather than provide information in a lecture format. This method is based on research suggesting that people retain material more effectively and are more motivated to learn when they are actively involved. The active learning process includes seeking, exchanging, synthesizing, expressing and applying knowledge.

At risk

Students perceived as having greater-than-average potential of failing or dropping out of school. While some researchers argue that "at risk" is characteristic of a situation, not a child, the term often connotes members of racial or cultural minority groups, poor or otherwise disadvantaged students or non-native speakers of English. Teen parents and students with a history of drug use, discipline problems, abuse or neglect also are frequently referred to as "at risk."

Collaborative decision making

Also known as **shared decision making**. Collaborative decision making involves teachers — and often parents, students and community members — in decisions traditionally made by district and/or building administrators alone. The composition, focus and authority of collaborative decision-making bodies vary among districts and schools.

Site-based management is similar in that it places the authority and responsibility for decisions regarding budget, curriculum, personnel and/or school policies in the hands of individual school staffs, as opposed to a central office or the school district. (Other closely related terms include **school-based management, school-site autonomy, school-site budgeting, administrative decentralization and shared governance.**

Cooperative learning

A teaching and learning strategy in which students study in pairs, triads or groups independent of the teacher. Used to complement direct instruction by the teacher, cooperative learning requires students to work together to find information, solve problems and complete projects and assignments. The objectives of this approach are to encourage teamwork among classmates, help students develop effective interpersonal communication skills, minimize behavior problems through positive peer relationships and teach students how to teach others and themselves.

Criterion-referenced test

An exam in which a student's performance is assessed in relationship to an established criterion. Most minimum competency exams are of this type. A norm-referenced test, by contrast, reports individual scores in relationship to other students' performance on the same exam. The SAT is norm-referenced.

Didactic instruction

A teaching method comprised of lecture and the use of textbooks rather than labs or demonstrations. A didactic approach is characterized by the systematic presentation of factual material, as opposed to class discussion or the exploration of themes.

Empower

Either "give authority to" or "enable," depending on context. The term "teacher empowerment" usually means granting faculty members authority to make and implement decisions about curriculum, methods, school policies and budgets. The term "student empowerment" generally means helping students develop the attitudes, habits, behaviors and skills they need to achieve in and beyond school. In both cases, empowerment is assumed to increase self-image, self-determination and motivation to perform.

Exhibition

Refers to methods of student assessment that require students to demonstrate what they know and can do, as an alternative to traditional paper-pencil tests. Exhibitions may take many forms, including class presentations, speeches, readings, demonstrations and artistic performances. Teachers often videotape exhibitions for later review and as a record of student progress.

Experiential learning

Learning-by-doing. In contrast to teaching and learning methods that focus largely on the history, principles and/or theory of a particular subject, experiential learning involves students in practical activities to help further their knowledge, appreciation or skills. While experiential learning opportunities may take place inside the classroom, they more commonly take the form of internships, community service projects, student exchanges, class trips and similar activities.

Grade-level promotion

Advancing students to the next school class or grade upon satisfactory completion of classwork, generally at the end of each school year. Students who fail to meet academic standards for grade-level promotion sometimes are "socially promoted" to keep them with classmates their own age. A student may also be retained to repeat a grade, usually by consensus of his or her teacher, principal and parents.

Language-based approach

A teaching and learning strategy that requires students to speak or write about the processes they use to gather information and solve problems. The goals of this approach are to increase students' capacities to use language effectively, to strengthen the connection between language and thought and to make students more aware of their own thinking and learning strategies. In a language-based math classroom, for example, a student might talk his way through a story problem or explain how he/she arrived at an answer to an equation.

Mainstream education

The prevailing type of schooling (including teaching and learning approaches, materials, assessment methods and standards) offered to students in the United States at any point in time. Some researchers argue that a goal of alternative education for "at-risk" students and those in remedial classes, special education and "pull-out" programs should be to teach them the attitudes, behaviors, knowledge and skills that will allow them to function effectively in a mainstream classroom.

Peer tutoring

Students who demonstrate proficiency in a subject help teach less-accomplished students for a certain period of time each week. Based on the "one-room schoolhouse" model of education, peer tutoring is intended to increase the competence and confidence of "tutors," by causing them to reflect on how they know what they know and how best to present this information to other people. At the same time, peer tutoring aims to improve the performance of less skilled students by offering them the individual attention, support and encouragement of a classmate.

Pull-out program

An educational strategy in which students with special needs or substandard academic performance are grouped in classes separate from their peers. The most common types of pull-out programs focus on students with developmental delays, learning disabilities, emotional, behavioral or drug-related problems and on immigrant children who are non-native English speakers.

Remediation

A teaching and learning strategy that focuses on correcting or improving the study habits, knowledge, skills or general competence of students identified as performing below grade level or being at risk in other ways. Remediation usually involves separating these students into classes or programs characterized by slower-paced instruction, less demanding academic material and reduced expectations for achievement and performance.

School-within-a-school

A program that operates within a school, generally focused on a particular subject area or student group and often employing alternative teaching and learning strategies, materials or methods of assessment. Some schools-within-a-school address the needs of teenage parents or students with attendance or discipline problems. Others provide specialized instruction in fine arts, international studies, computers, business, science or other fields. School-within-a-school classes frequently are team-taught and sometimes operate on a different daily schedule than the rest of the school.

Site-based management (see Collaborative decision making)

Socratic questioning

A teaching and learning method based on the discussion of thought-provoking questions about fundamental human concerns — such as government, justice, freedom, conflict, responsibility and ethics. The aims of such discussion are to enable students to identify, explore and reflect on their opinions and beliefs, to expose them to other people's perspectives and to develop their critical-thinking, reasoning and communication skills. The teacher's role in Socratic discussion is to keep the exchange focused, help break big questions down into manageable parts and enable students to clarify their thoughts by rephrasing or asking questions or encouraging them to explain things to one another.

Tracking (See Ability grouping)

© Copyright 1991 by the Education Commission of the States (ECS). All rights reserved.

ECS is a nonprofit, nationwide interstate compact formed in 1965 to help governors, state legislators, state education officials and others develop policies to improve the quality of education at all levels.

The ECS offices are at 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, Colorado 80202-3427; 303-299-3600.

It is the policy of ECS to take affirmative action to prevent discrimination in its policies, programs and employment practices.

Work reported in this publication (SI-91-4) was funded in part by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. Copies are $8. Other publications in the **Restructuring the Education System** series are: *Keeping the Promises of Reform: A State Strategy* (SI-91-2), $4; *Building Private Sector and Community Support* (SI-91-3), $4; and *Communication* (SI-91-5), $4. The set is $15 plus $3 postage and handling.

Please order from the ECS Distribution Center, 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, Colorado 80202; 303-299-3692.

Education Commission of the States
707 17th Street, Suite 2700
Denver, CO 80202

Printed on recycled stock